

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

HUY VAN TRAN,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CR15-0120-JCC-5

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's motion for early termination of supervised release (Dkt. No. 1432). Having considered the relevant record, the Court DENIES the motion for the reasons explained herein.

Following Defendant's guilty plea to Conspiracy to Distribute Controlled Substances, the Court imposed a sentence of 96 months of imprisonment followed by five years of supervised release. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 372, 645, 1004.) That term of supervised release commenced in early 2023 (after three-months of detention at a U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement facility). (*See* Dkt. No. 1432 at 2.) Defendant now moves for early termination. (*See generally id.*).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court may terminate a term of supervised release "if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice." 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1). In deciding whether early termination is appropriate, the Court must consider several factors, including the nature and circumstances of the offense, the history and characteristics of the defendant, the need to deter criminal conduct, the need to protect the public

1 In support, Defendant cites his compliance with the conditions of supervision, elder care  
 2 responsibilities, stable housing, and consistent work history. (*See generally id.*) The United  
 3 States Pretrial Services and Probation Department supports early termination, noting that  
 4 Defendant requires little, if any, supervision at this point. (*See id.* at 3.) The Government  
 5 opposes, citing *inter alia* the gravity of Defendant's pre-incarceration conduct (both charged and  
 6 uncharged). (*See generally* Dkt. No. 1435.) Although it points to no deficiencies in Defendant's  
 7 performance while on supervised release or other problematic conduct post-release. (*Id.*)

8 While the Court is pleased with Defendant's performance to date, it does not find that  
 9 this, alone, warrants early termination. *See United States v. Lussier*, 104 F.3d 32, 36 (2nd Cir.  
 10 1997). Given the gravity of Defendant's pre-incarceration conduct, a roughly 20-month term of  
 11 supervision, even if fully compliant with the terms and conditions, is not enough for Defendant  
 12 to support a reduction in the term of supervision, when view in the light of the 18 U.S.C.  
 13 § 3553(a) factors. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1).

14 Accordingly, Defendant's motion (Dkt. No. 1432) is DENIED. The Court encourages  
 15 Defendant to renew his request once he has satisfactorily completed a more significant period of  
 16 supervised release.

17  
 18 DATED this 30th day of August 2024.

19  
 20  
 21 

22 John C. Coughenour  
 23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
 24

25 from further crimes, and the need to avoid disparity among similarly situated defendants. 18  
 26 U.S.C. § 3583(e) (citing to factors listed by 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)); *United States v. Emmett*, 749  
 F.3d 817, 820 (9th Cir. 2014).